



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,859	11/24/2003	Craig L. Reding	03-1013	5176
32127	7590	12/14/2006	EXAMINER	
VERIZON			ANWAH, OLISA	
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500				
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			2614	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,859	REDING ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olisa Anwah	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 16-22 and 56-62 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12,14,15,23-36,38-52,54,55,63-76 and 78-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 13,37,53 and 77 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 23-36, 38-52, 54, 55, 63-76 and 78-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,065,198 (hereinafter Brown) in view of Ludwig et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103152 (hereinafter Ludwig).

Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a method comprising:
establishing a conference call between a plurality of users, including an initiating user;
ascertaining identities of a plurality of destination devices for an audio stream corresponding to the conference call, the destination devices corresponding to the plurality of users;

providing the audio stream to the plurality of destination devices; and

storing data (see the identification from column 9) contained in the audio stream (see Figure 4).

With further respect to claim 1, Brown does not disclose selectively deleting the identification, while the conference call is ongoing, based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call. Regardless, Ludwig discloses this feature (see paragraph 0161). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Brown with selectively deleting the identification, while the conference call is ongoing, based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call as taught by Ludwig. This modification would have improved the convenience of Brown by notifying all other conference participants that the participant has exited as suggested by both Ludwig (see paragraph 0161) and Brown (see column 6).

Regarding claim 2, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 3, see column 3 of Brown.

Regarding claim 4, see column 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 5, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 6, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 7, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 8, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 9, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 10, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 11, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 12, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 14, see Figure 32 of Brown.

Regarding claim 15, see column 3 of Brown.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 25, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 26, see column 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 27, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 28, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 29, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 30, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 32, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 33, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 34, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 35, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 36, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 38, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 39, see Figures 7A-B of Brown.

Regarding claim 40, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 42, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 43, see column 3 of Brown.

Regarding claim 44, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 45, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 46, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 47, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 48, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 49, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 50, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 51, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 52, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 54, see Figure 32 of Brown.

Regarding claim 55, see column 3 of Brown.

Claim 63 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 64 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 65, see column 11 of Brown.

Regarding claim 66, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 67, see Figure 10 of Brown.

Regarding claim 68, see Figure 4 of Brown.

Regarding claim 69, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 70, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Art Unit: 2614

Claim 71 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 72, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 73, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 74, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 75, see Figures 21 and 24 of Brown.

Regarding claim 76, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Regarding claim 78, see Figure 7A of Brown.

Regarding claim 79, see Figures 7A-B of Brown.

Regarding claim 80, see Figure 21 of Brown.

Claim 81 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 82 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 83 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 84 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 85 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 86 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 13, 37, 53 and 77 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2614

4. Claims 16 and 56 are allowed because the Prior Art of record fails to teach the audio stream is sent to a first destination device associated with one of the plurality of users invited to the conference call who declines to participate in the conference call.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant is 100% correct. The callhandles disclosed in Ludwig are not audio stream data. However the Examiner does not rely on Ludwig to show that the callhandles are audio stream data. Because Brown teaches that callhandles can be derived from audio stream data (see This identification...may be made by analyzing the vocal characteristics of the participants voice from column 9), the combination of Brown and Ludwig discloses the claimed limitation of selectively deleting the stored audio stream data, while the conference call is ongoing, based on a determination that a user has exited the conference call.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2614

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2614

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

OA

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
November 22, 2006

FAN-TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
~ ~ ~ TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
